

1 DANIEL J. BERGESON, Bar No. 105439
dbergeson@be-law.com
2 JOHN W. FOWLER, Bar No. 037463
jfowler@be-law.com
3 MELINDA M. MORTON, Bar No. 209373
mmorton@be-law.com
4 MICHAEL W. STEBBINS, Bar No. 138326
mstebbins@be-law.com
5 BERGESON, LLP
303 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 500
6 San Jose, CA 95110-2712
Telephone: (408) 291-6200
7 Facsimile: (408) 297-6000
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
VERIGY US, INC.
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13 VERIGY US, INC, a Delaware Corporation

Case No. C07 04330 RMW (HRL)

14 Plaintiff,

**PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

15 vs.

16 ROMI OMAR MAYDER, an individual;
17 WESLEY MAYDER, an individual; SILICON
TEST SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation;
and SILICON TEST SOLUTIONS, LLC, a
18 California Limited Liability Corporation,
inclusive,

Judge: Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
Ctrm: 6

19 Defendants.
20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11(a) and 79-5(b), Plaintiff Verigty U.S., Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “Verigty”) requests that the following materials be filed under seal, as they contain confidential information that is protected by the Stipulated Protective Order entered by the Court on August 29, 2007. The documents submitted under seal include:

1. Portions of the Reply to Defendants' Response to Evidentiary Objections, dated January 15, 2008.
 2. Portions of the Supplemental Declaration of Michael W. Stebbins Accompanying Reply to Defendants' Response to Evidentiary Objections, dated January 15, 2008.

9 These materials (hereafter “the Materials”) each disclose information that has been
10 designated as “Highly Confidential—Attorneys’ Eyes Only” or “Confidential” by the parties
11 under the protective order, without objection to those designations (although Verigy reserves its
12 rights to challenge such designations pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order). Although the
13 information in the Materials has been designated as protected from disclosure under the Protective
14 Order, Verigy relies on this information in support of its motion for preliminary injunction. The
15 parties’ confidentiality interest therefore overcomes the right of public access to the record, as a
16 substantial probability exists that the parties’ overriding confidentiality interest will be prejudiced
17 if the record is not sealed. Further, the proposed sealing is narrowly tailored and no less restrictive
18 means exist to achieve this overriding interest

19 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 79-5(b)-(c), Verity therefore lodges the Materials with this
20 Court, and respectfully requests leave to file the aforementioned documents under seal.

Respectfully submitted,

22 || Dated: January 15, 2008

BERGESON, LLP

By: /s/

Michael W. Stebbins
Attorneys for Plaintiff
VERIGY US, INC.